

Central Intelligence Agency



Washington, D.C. 20505

OLL 84-0007/2

31 JAN 1984

The Honorable Harold S. Sawyer  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Sawyer:

In reference to your letter of 3 January 1984 concerning a debriefing for C-TEC Inc., an unsuccessful bidder on Central Intelligence Agency RFP 83A-232, our procurement staff is presently contacting the unsuccessful bidders to schedule debriefings and will be happy to meet with representatives of C-TEC at their convenience. I want to assure you that the proposals received in connection with this RFP were evaluated in strict accordance with established competitive procurement policies and the evaluation procedures set forth in the solicitation. Furthermore, I am confident that our procurement staff will satisfy C-TEC's concerns regarding our competitive procurement process and the manner in which this particular solicitation was handled during their debriefing session.

The requirement being satisfied by this solicitation covers the raised access flooring portion of a two-year renovation project in one of our Washington area facilities. The building undergoing renovation has rigorous standards for such flooring due to the special equipment installed and used in that facility. Thus, specifications were developed to meet these needs and were validated as non-restrictive in character prior to release of our solicitation.

Proposals were solicited from six companies, including C-TEC, which appeared to have the ability to satisfy the requirement with their standard flooring products. The solicitation was structured such that all information required to make a thorough and equitable evaluation of proposals would be submitted by the bidders. These submissions included pricing and delivery data, company capability data, manufacturing specifications and engineering drawings, reports from independent test laboratories validating conformance of proposed materials to specifications, and samples of the proposed flooring materials. Thus, special presentations to our evaluation panel by individual bidders were not required.

The panel's initial evaluation disclosed that all proposals received were deficient. In this regard, it appears C-TEC has a misperception regarding a comment that theirs was "the only bid package that...included all necessary documents." Such was not the case, as nine deficiencies were found in their initial proposal. Regarding C-TEC's complaint on our method of soliciting a revised proposal to correct these deficiencies, it was necessary to solicit these revisions from all bidders via telephone in order to award the contract and meet our building renovation schedule. Our letters detailing proposal deficiencies and requesting revised bids were read verbatim to all bidders over the phone, with sufficient time allowed for direct transcription. C-TEC was treated equally with all other bidders in this regard and was at no disadvantage in responding by the established due date.

Although C-TEC's initial proposal contained several significant deficiencies it was included in the competitive range for further consideration and C-TEC was afforded an opportunity to correct those deficiencies with a revised proposal. Upon reviewing C-TEC's revised proposal, the evaluation panel concluded that their proposed flooring material did not meet the specifications and required level of performance in two major areas, and recommended that their proposal should not be given further consideration. In accordance with our competitive evaluation procedures, a Contracting Officer determination was made to remove C-TEC's proposal from the competitive range on the basis that it contained deficiencies which discussions with the offerer could not reasonably be expected to cure. It is not clear whether C-TEC fully understands this aspect of our evaluation procedures. Please be assured, however, that their representatives will receive a full explanation at the debriefing.

I trust the foregoing is responsive to your inquiry and provides reassurance that your constituent's interests in this matter have been properly safeguarded by this Agency.

Sincerely,

/s/ Clair E. George

Clair E. George  
Director, Office of Legislative Liaison

Distribution:

Original - Addressee

1 - D/OLL

1 - DD/OLL

1 - C/P&SCB/PD/OL

✓ 1 - LEG/OLL

1 - OLL Record

1 - OLL Chrono

LD/OLL 25 January 1984)

Drafted by: , C/P&SCB/PD/OL

STAT  
STAT

STAT  
STAT